Withdrawal of multinatiqnal companies from the Indian Market

2922. SHRI SATISH PRADHAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a)wheher it is a fact that some multinational pharmaceutical companies are closing down plants and wihdrawing from Indian markets;

(to) if so, what is Government's reaction thereto;

(c) whether this is in accordance with the conditions imposed on them while issuing them manufacturing licences;

(d) whether it is a fact that copying of their patents by Indian companies had declined their return on in vestments; and

(e) whether Government have taken action against the Indian companies for violation of the Patents Act, if so, the names thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OP CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) One Company has suspended production operations at one of its plants and another has intimated that its principals propose to disinvest their share in the company's equity. The reasons indicated by the companies for doing so do not include decline of return on investment due to copying of their patents by Indian companies. There is no condition in the manufacturing licences which prohibits these companies from closing down or withdrawing from the Indian market.

(e) No instances have come to the knowledge of the Patent Office so as to take action against Indian companies for violation of the patents Act.

2923. *[Transferred to 26th March,* 1993]

नेशनल फर्टिलाइजर लिमिटेड में गैस का रिसाव

2924. **श्री सोमपाल :** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पिछले दो वर्षों में नेशनल फर्टिलाइजर लिमिटेड के एककों में गैस रिसाव आदि की कुल कितनी घटनाएं हुई और ये घटनायें कब-कब हुई ;

(ख) इन दुर्घटनाओं में कितन व्यक्ति मारे गए और कितने अपंग हुए तथा उन्हें कितना-कितना मुआवजा दिया गया; और

(ग) इन दुर्घटनाओं के जिम्मेदार लोगों के विरुद्ध क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री एडुआर्डो फलेरियो) : (क) नशनल फर्टिलाइजर्स लि० (एन. एफ. एल.) के पानीपत और भटिंडा एककों में (प्रत्येक में एक-एक) क्रमश: 26.8.92 और 3.9.92 को गत दो वर्षों में गैस रिसाव की दो दुर्घटनाएं हुई।

(ख) ब्यौरे निम्न प्रकार है :–

एकक का नाम	मृत व्यक्तियों की संख्या	विकलांग हुए व्यक्तियों की संख्या	भुगतान किया गया कुल मुआवजा
(i) पानीपत . .	10	शून्य	22.80 लाख रु.
(ii) भटिंडा . .	शून्य	शून्य	शून्य

(ग) पानीपत में अमोनिया गैस रिसाव के कारणों की जांच करने के लिए एन० एफ० एल० द्वारा स्थापित की गयी जांच समिति ने व्यक्तिगत रूप से या सामूहिक रूप स उत्तरदायित्व निर्धारित नहीं किया क्योंकि प्रत्यक्ष रूप से अन्तर्ग्रस्त व्यक्ति भी दुर्घटना मे मर गए। भटिण्डा में लघु दुर्घटना के लिए एन० एफ० एल० द्वारा कोई विस्तृत जांच करनी आवश्यक नहीं समझी गयी।

Exemption of Betamethasone Disodrum Sulphate from price control

2925. DE. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY; SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Betamethasone Disodium Sulphate being used in place of Phosphate has been exempted from price control with effect from 28th Oct. 1992; and

(b) what were the salient features of R and D on account of which it was exempted from price control?

THE MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Bulk Drug Betamethasone Disodium phosphate has been exempted from price control w.e.f. 28.2.92 on the basis of indigenous R and D efforts, undertaken by M/s. Glaxo Ltd.

(b) The major features of R and D "efforts are (i) improvement in the production efficiency (ii) reduction in the cost of production (iii) saving in foreign exchange and (iv) production from basic stage.

Employees of IDPL charge sheeted without specifyign any Reason

2926. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the replies TO the Unstarred Questions 2262 dated 30th July, 1992 and 4597 dated 20th August, 1992 respectively and state:

(a) whether chargesheets were issued against to employees by the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited's disciplinary authorities for unauthorised absence under rule 5 (7) read with rule 25 (of IDPL ODA Rules) in November, 1988;

(b) whether the same chargesheets were issued without specifyiing any reasons under the signature of the Chairman under rule 5(7) read with 'rule 25in May, 1990, if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether a notice was issued to the employees for unauthorised absence under new rule 30-a by a junior Officer, if so the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether the employees were asked to reply to the chargesheet of May, 1990 under rule 25 with, rule 5(7), in January, 1991, if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) The employees referred to in, the question were holding the posts below the Board level. The authority competent to take a decision in matters relating to such employees is the management of the company. The issues raised essentially pertain to the administration of the company. According to the information furnished by Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited (IDPL), a charge sheet was issued to Shri Kamal Bhasin, the then Marketing Executive on 17.11.89 under the signature of General Manager (Production). Later, the same charge sheet was re-issued on 21.5.90, under the signature of the then Chairman and Managing Director who was con-